

Today's Topics:

About the Third-Party List...

ARRL

ARRL PFB 48

CoCo WEFAX

RST (2 msgs)

What about for us SWL's ? Re: Tuning dipoles and antennas.

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 89 11:49:54 CST

From: rlwest@flop2.csc.ti.com (Bob West, WA8YCD)

Subject: About the Third-Party List...

Message-ID: <8912141802.AA12446@ti.com>

Howdy!

Someone (sorry, I forgot who!) asked me about the current Third-Party List, and I did not have it on hand at the time. Since I can't remember whether the inquiry came from external (INFOHAMS) or internal (TIHAMS) I am sending this to both...

Regards,

Bob WA8YCD

RLWEST@FLOPN2.CSC.TI.COM

Date: 14 Dec 89 18:24:45 GMT

From: idacrd!mac@princeton.edu (Robert McGwier)

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <536@idacrd.UUCP>

>From article <5797@cps3xx.UUCP>, by usenet@cps3xx.UUCP (Usenet file owner):

> I have been carrying on an e-mail conversation with steview@wyse.com

> concerning interaction with league officials. I feel that this letter

> I wrote to steview is relevant, and would be appropriately posted here.

>

> The ARRL tries to present itself as a general purpose organization which

> represents the broad interests of ALL amateurs. As such, they (in the

> past) have tried to include a little of everything in QST. This is as it

> should be for a general purpose organization. They are now changing

> their tune where microwave coverage in QST is concerned. It is not

> acceptable to ENTIRELY DROP microwave coverage from QST as they have

> done. It is also not acceptable to shuttle microwave coverage off to

It is also not acceptable for you to libel the League. If you will read the column "The World Above 50 Mhz", they clearly state a change in emphasis to INCLUDE Microwave coverage. Bill is an honest, hardworking valued member of the above 50 Mhz crowd and he would GLADLY include submissions to the column on topics of interest to Microwave. If you are unhappy that you are not getting a column per month is one thing, to say that you have NO coverage is demonstrably false.

(Bill Tynan, W3XO is a personal friend and a co-director of AMSAT with myself. I for one believe in stating all the facts so that you can make your own judgements on the content of my statements.)

Bob

--

My opinions are my own no matter | Robert W. McGwier, N4HY
who I work for! ;-) | CCR, AMSAT, etc.

Date: 14 Dec 89 14:55:09 GMT
From: att!cbnewsh!ka2czu@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (robert.switzer)
Subject: ARRL PFB 48
Message-ID: <6612@cbnewsh.ATT.COM>

>From article <18230011@hpfcdj.HP.COM>, by myers@hpfcdj.HP.COM (Bob Myers):
> are more likely to be absorbed into the noise before you can get enough
> signal back to do any good. Due to these *two* effects, there is only a
> certain range of frequencies which are suitable for communication over a
> given path at a given time of day (plus other conditions affecting the
> strength/height of the various ionospheric layers). Above this range,
> the signals punch right through before they get back to the surface; below it,
> of "reflection", you'd get AM broadcast band stations all over the country
> in mid-afternoon!)

One additional fact which should be remembered is that ground wave communication is much more effective at low and very low frequencies. If you do some reading, you'll find that the "experts" thought no long distance communication was possible above a certain frequency. One of the factors that led "them" to this conclusion was the attenuation of ground waves at higher frequencies.

At any rate, the improved ground waves is another reason why you don't

notice the skip zone at broadcast frequencies, even with the high day-time absorbtion, which was pointed out.

Robert S.

--

Robert Switzer
(201)949-0057
AT&T, Crawford Corner Rd.
Rm. H02K318, Holmdel, NJ 07733

Date: 14 Dec 89 15:00:15 GMT
From: att!cbnewsj!newsman@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (john.ferro..jr)
Subject: CoCo WEFAX
Message-ID: <2844@cbnewsj.ATT.COM>

Mike,
I'm sorry I have to communicate with you this way, but the machine I'm on does not seem to have a link to either of your E-mail addressses.

Mike I received the WEFAX program this morning via E-mail. I have one problem though. It seems the machine that I'm on does not have access to listserv so I'm not able to down load that "cut program". Are there any alternatives to decodeing WEFAX 105? If you have a copy could you send it to me? Also, I have a color computer II without a diskdrive or joystick. You mentioned that a diskdrive was not necessary if you did not plan on saving the pictures. How do you receive the pictures if you don't have a disk drive to run the program on? Is the program only necessary for saving the pictures? Is the cable that is needed available at Radio Shack? If not is it difficult to build one? Thanks for your time and patience.

John Ferro mtx5d!jjf

Date: 14 Dec 89 19:41:40 GMT
From: victim.dec.com!reisert@decwrl.dec.com (Jim -- LTN1-2/H03 -- DTN 226-6905 14-Dec-1989 1443)
Subject: RST
Message-ID: <8912141941.AA02969@decwrl.dec.com>

In article <1263@marlin.NOSC.MIL>, price@marlin.NOSC.MIL (James N. Price) writes...

>You need the exchange to get the multipliers (states, countries, zones, or

>whatever), but the signal report is really superfluous.

In fact, in the CQ WW DX contest, all you need is the callsign to figure out the exchange. Notice how you never hear a DX station ask you to repeat your report, but they will ask you to repeat your callsign (maybe it's just me, I do run 5W on occasion). The only times this doesn't work is for folks operating outside of their 'standard' zone (i.e. AD1C operating from California). Then the DX station may ask for a repeat on your zone, since that's confusing. In the ARRL contest, you need to get the power, which is different for each DX station, and the DX stations need to get your state. Are Q rates in the ARRL lower than in the WW (Ken, K1EA, you may answer this one if you're so inclined ;-).

I ran QRP in the CQ WW DX Contest this past November, and yes, I had to repeat my call a lot! But I got 599s from the same stations. Strange! I did notice this year that some people gave out 559s, about 4 if I remember correctly. The rest were 5NN. In previous years, I got 579s instead of 599s. Guess it's easier to type the same 2 numbers (i.e. the two 5s) than three distinct numbers (579). But it's easier to write a '7' than a '5' by hand.

jim, AD1C, AD1C, A-D-1-C, A-D A-D A-D-1C etc. etc. etc.

=====
"The opinions expressed here in no way represent the views of Digital Equipment Corporation."

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| James J. Reisert | Internet: reisert@tallis.enet.dec.com |
| Digital Equipment Corp. | UUCP: ...decwrl!tallis.enet!reisert |
| 295 Foster Street | |
| P.O. Box 1123 | |
| Littleton, MA 01460 | |

Date: 14 Dec 89 19:19:31 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uakari.prima.te.wisc.edu!larry!sde@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Scott Ellington)
Subject: RST
Message-ID: <790@larry.sal.wisc.edu>

Seems to me there isn't much point in having such a totally meaningless piece of information (such as RST) in the exchange at all. Contest rules should either require some information be exchanged which isn't automatically known, or drop the exchange requirement. Why clutter up the bands with all those "59's" and "599's"? On the other hand, shouldn't a valid contact consist of a little more than an exchange of call signs?

Speaking of call signs, shouldn't stations be required to give their own call at least once per contact?

K9MA

Date: 14 Dec 89 17:33:05 GMT
From: cbmvax!grr@uunet.uu.net (George Robbins)
Subject: What about for us SWL's ? Re: Tuning dipoles and antennas.
Message-ID: <9006@cbmvax.commodore.com>

In article <1517@speedy.mcnc.org> kgreer@mcnc.org.UUCP (Ken Greer) writes:

>
> Question about grounding: Just about every antenna-making tutorial says to
> ground to a water-pipe ("no, not the plastic pipe kind") or similar. If a
> receiver is powered through a 3-conductor power cord, would the antenna
> braid/shield (in coax,e.g.) automatically be connected to a "good" ground,
> assuming that the house electrical wiring is properly installed? Doesn't
> the chassis frame give you pretty much the same thing, since the ground wire
> in the home wiring goes back to ground anyway at the breaker box/service drop?

There are really two issues. One is that you want a good DC/low frequency ground to protect against shocks. The other is that probably want a good RF ground, especially if you are using some kind of unbalanced antenna like a long wire. The 3-prong cord (assuming correctly wired 3-prong outlets) will provide a decent DC ground, but for RF, it's another piece of random wire.

For a receiver this is probably not a live or die kind of thing, but you could try running decent ground and see if the signal level comes up noticeably or the noise level decreases. Of course you also want a good ground for your lighting arrestor, so you might as well hook it up to the radio while you're at it...

--

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| George Robbins - now working for, | uucp: {uunet pyramid rutgers}!cbmvax!grr |
| but no way officially representing | arpa: cbmvax!grr@uunet.uu.net |
| Commodore, Engineering Department | fone: 215-431-9255 (only by moonlite) |

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1019
